

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| ATIC NO. | _____ | TYPE OF OBSERVATION | STATION ID# | Incident #168 |
| AF. NO. | _____ | TIME OF OBSERVING | DATE OF INFO | 20 July 1948 |
| OBJECT NO. | _____ | LOCATION | Arnhem, Holland | |
| SIZE | _____ | SOURCE | Civil Official | |
| SHAPE | _____ | DATE IN TO ATIC | --- | |
| NO. IN GROUP | 1 | COLOR | --- | |
| VEHICLE | Same as V-2 | SPED (Comparable to Y-2) or no | High | 1500 ft |
| POSITION | SKETCHES | ALTITUDE | Very high | 15000 ft |
| Temporary ATIC Form 329 (2 Jan 52) | | MANEUVERS | Ground | |
| | | | Sketch Evidence | |

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Incident #168 -- The Hague -- 20 July 1943

The information given here is too limited even for guesswork. It is extremely difficult to take at face value the report of an aircraft with two decks and no wings travelling with supersonic speed, even if "seen four times through clouds" by the chief of the Court of Damage and his daughter. It seems much more probable that the observers had a subjective impression of ordinary aircraft or a fireball. Even though these two items are at opposite ends of the scale, there is nothing in the evidence to favor one or the other.

In passing, it is interesting to note that this incident occurred just four days before the famous "Alabama spaceship." Maybe our visitors from Mars were cruising around!

UNCLASSIFIED

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

B-71168-6

Incident No. 168 -- 20 July 1948, 1330 Hours, Arnhem, The Hague.

One observer saw an object intermittently through clouds four times. The object had two decks and no wings, was said to be very high, with speed comparable to V-2.

AMC Opinion: Insufficient information. It may be well to point out that the V-2 is not visible in flight, therefore, it follows that this object would not have been visible as described if traveling at that speed.

Dr HYNEK'S EVALUATIONS EXTRACTED FROM PROJECT GRUDGE REPORT.

INCIDENT INDEX

1. Astronomical

a. High probability:

#26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 48, 49, 59, 60, 66, 69, 70, 94,
95, 96, 97, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 116, 119, 132, 136, 140,
147, 148, 158, 174, 184, 185, 187, 197, 203, 204, 208, 216,
219, 238.

b. Fair or low probability:

#19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 35, 36, 46, 60, 63, 67, 80, 82, 93, 100,
112, 120, 121, 129, 130, 144, 153, 165, 166, 167, 175, 192,
199, 202, 205, 220, 230, 240.

2. Non-astronomical but suggestive of other explanations

a. Balloons or ordinary aircraft:

#3, 11, 22, 41, 42, 53, 54, 73, 81, 83, 91, 92, 113, 114, 115,
126, 131, 138, 141, 145, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 163,
169, 171, 173, 178, 180, 182, 188, 190, 194, 195, 196, 198,
200, 201, 209, 210, 217, 222, 235, 237, 239.

b. Rockets, flares or failing bodies:

#4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 25, 56, 65, 78, 106, 107,
108, 109, 133, 170, 211, 218.

c. Miscellaneous (reflections, auroral streamers, birds, etc.):
#39, 89, 123, 124, 128, 146, 164, 181, 189, 214, 221, 231, 234.

3. Non-astronomical, with no explanation evident

a. Lack of evidence precludes explanation:

#38, 44, 45, 47, 55, 57, 72, 86, 87, 88, 90, 99, 110, 117, 118,
125, 127, 137, 139, 149, 150, 177, 179, 191, 206, 212, 213,
229, 232, 233.

b. Evidence offered suggests no explanation:

#1, 2, 10, 17, 21, 29, 37, 40, 51, 52, 58, 61, 62, 64, 68, 71,
75, 76, 77, 79, 84, 105, 111, 122, 135, 151, 152, 154, 162,
163, 172, 176, 183, 186, 193, 207, 215, 223, 224, 225, 226,
227, 236, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245.

20 JULY 48

With 104 incidents thus eliminated, there remain thirty-four which contain some evidence but have no apparent ready explanation. This statement is true only under the assumption that the evidence is accepted as reliable and accurate. When psychological and physiological factors are taken into consideration, all of these incidents can be explained rationally, as pointed out by Rand Corporation and Dr. Fitts of Air Materiel Command Aero-Medical Laboratory (see APPENDIX "C").

Air Materiel Command Aero-Medical Laboratory (See Appendix "C")
212 Incidents considered)

There are sufficient psychological explanations for the major unidentified flying objects to provide plausible explanations for reports not otherwise explainable. These errors in identifying visual stimuli result chiefly from inability to estimate speed, distance, or size.

All of the remaining 34 incidents are treated in detail in this report. These incidents form no pattern in regard to area of sight, type of object, or manner of performance. There are indications, however, that some sightings were influenced by earlier reports, which probably would not have been considered unusual or reported given no publicity.

APPENDIX

Project Gringo

Summary of AOC Evaluation of Remaining Reports

VII. Summary of AOC Evaluation of Remaining Reports

The remaining unexplained incidents (see Appendix "C") exhibited few common characteristics. Two of them, by statements of the reporters, could not have been made had the witnesses not read of the Mt. Rainier incident (Incident No. 17). Most were distributed without pattern throughout the United States. A few were outside the U. S. No two descriptions of appearance or performance were exactly alike. The reported sightings occurred at various times during the life

APPENDIX X

In the following section of this report, each remaining unexplained incident is considered separately. It is not the intent to generalize the character of observers, but each case has unavoidable elements in common or singular. The numerical designation is that of the number of the incident in the project files.